

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. In light of the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action objects to the specification for failing to disclose that the base station does not broadcast the authentication request information. The claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the same reason. Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification and rejection of the claims.

As explicitly recited with reference to Figure 7, in one embodiment, wireless base station 11 asks an inner LAN authenticating server to authenticate wireless terminal 22. This authentication is performed without an authentication request issued from the base station. Even if the base station or authentication server has not authenticated the wireless terminal, the wireless base station permits the wireless terminal to be contacted. The base station then distributes packets that have transmitted from the wireless terminal so that wireless terminal can access a firewall server. As such, the specification clearly discloses that the base station does not broadcast the authentication request information. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections to the specification and claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,873,609 ("Jones") in view of Router Plugins: A Software Architecture for Next Generation Routers" ("Decasper"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

Neither Jones nor Decasper disclose that the base station does not broadcast the authentication request information. In Jones, A tunneling protocol communication link is established. However, Jones is silent with respect to broadcasting authentication information.

Jones fails to disclose transmitting the packet received from said introduced portion to said predetermined server network connecting device when said contents of said first package distribution table represented the terminal station has not been authenticated for said LAN.

The Office Action asserts that this claimed limitation is disclosed at column 3, lines 20-37 in Jones. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the cited portion of Jones, a new user ID, a temporary password are preprogrammed in CD software that is signaled to an authentication server. The authentication server recognizes the user as a new user and communicates a set of filters so that a point-to-point protocol session is set up between the user's PC and the access operator's registration server. The user is barred from accessing any other services. Additionally, there are no unregistered packets to be transmitted. This is merely a login technique. The addition of Decasper

fails to cure the deficiency in Jones discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Further, the authentication request information of claim 1 does not correspond to the new user of Jones, nor does the reception packet correspond to the new user of Jones. In addition, RADIUS which is regarded as allegedly corresponding to the authentication managing portion of claim 1 performs authentication for accessing the access Network operator registration Server 36, and does not perform authentication for using the managed IP network.

Further, the Examiner asserts that "transferring the packet received from the interface portion to the LAN" of claim 1 corresponds to "transferring the packet to the managed IP network" reside in somewhere. However, this assertion is incorrect because the access operator RADIUS authentication server 34 does not transfer the packet anywhere. Still further, the Examiner asserts that "transmitting to the packet received from the interface portion to the predetermined Server or network-connected device" of claim 1 corresponds to "transmitting the packet to the Access Operators registration server 36. However, this assertion is wrong, because the packet is transferred between the server 36 and the PC 22 not via the Server 34. Jones is silent as to the two destinations of the packet which once was received by the Server (server 34) of claim 1.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cropper in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,491 ("Peck"). Peck fails to cure the deficiencies in Cropper discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the

Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: September 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs